

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims:

Claims 26-50 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, as set forth above, claims 31, 35, 44, and 47 are amended.

The May 19, 2009 Office Action:

In the May 19, 2009 Office Action (hereinafter "Office Action"), claims 35-43 and 47-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,210 to Sayko (hereinafter "Sayko"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,832,072 to Rozenblit (hereinafter "Rozenblit"). Also, claims 26-34 and 44-46 were allowed.

Applicant very much appreciates the Primary Examiner's careful review of the application and the allowance of claims 26-34 and 44-46.

In response, as set forth above, claims 31, 35, 44, and 47 have been amended for clarification. Specifically, independent claims 35 and 47 have been amended in response to the Primary Examiner's arguments and inquiries set forth on page 7 of the Office Action ("Response to Arguments"). Claims 35 and 47 have also been amended to incorporate features of allowed claims 26-34 and 44-46. In addition, independent claims 31 and 44 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Support for the amendments can be found in the disclosure as originally filed, for example in the original claims, in paragraphs on page 10, lines 20-23 through page 21, lines 1-2 of the specification, and in FIGS. 2 and 3 of the drawings. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically referred to herein as being included for the purpose of distinguishing the claims from cited references are included for the purpose of clarification, consistence and/or grammatical/spelling correction only.

It is now believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The following remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 35-43 and 47-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayko, in view of Rozenblit. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 35-43:

As set forth above, amended claim 35 recites “a system for providing calling number restoral, comprising:

a routing module provisioned with an incoming trigger and an outgoing trigger;
an out-of-network entity in communication with the routing module; and
a control module in communication with the routing module,

wherein the system determines that *a call originally directed to an in-network called number is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity*, removes and stores the private call information from the call after determining that the call is to be redirected to the out-of-network entity, redirects the call originally directed to the *in-network called number* to the out-of-network entity *after removing and storing the private call information*, and restores the stored private call information to the call when the call re-enters the network *from the out-of-network entity*.” (Emphasis added.)

The Office Action relies on Sayko and Rozenblit for the features recited in claim 35. However, it is admitted on page 4 of the Office Action that Sayko does not disclose “receiving, into the network, an outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity; and forwarding the outgoing communication to a forwarding destination within the network”, i.e. Sayko does not disclose “*restoring] the stored private call information to the call when the call re-enters the network from the out-of-network entity*” as recited in amended claim 35. (Emphasis added.) Moreover, neither Sayko nor Rozenblit, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or

suggest a system that “determines that *a call originally directed to an in-network called number is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity*, removes and stores the private call information from the call after determining that the call is to be redirected to the out-of-network entity, [and] redirects the call originally directed to the *in-network called number* to the out-of-network entity *after removing and storing the private call information*” as recited in amended claim 35, and having all of the other features recited in amended claim 35. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, neither Sayko nor Rozenblit, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest a system having all of the features recited in amended claim 35.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 35, as amended, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sayko and/or Rozenblit for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, claims 36-43, which depend from now allowable amended claim 35, are patentable for at least this reason.

Claims 47-50:

As set forth above, amended claim 47 recites a “control module for preventing private communication information from exiting a network, comprising:

means for determining that *a communication* originally directed to an in-network called number is to be redirected *to an out-of-network entity*;

means for removing the private communication information from *the communication after the determining means has determined that the communication is to be redirected to the out-of-network entity*;

means for storing the private communication information *removed by the removing means*;

means for redirecting *the communication* to the out-of-network entity *after the private communication information has been removed by the removing means and stored by the storing means*;

means for retrieving the private communication information *stored by the storing means when the communication re-enters the network from the out-of-network entity*; and

means for restoring the private communication information *retrieved by the retrieving means* to the communication.” (Emphasis added.)

The Office Action relies on Sayko and Rozenblit for the features recited in claim 47. However, as set forth above, on page 4 of the Office Action it is admitted that Sayko does not disclose “receiving, into the network, an outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity; and forwarding the outgoing communication to a forwarding destination within the network”, i.e. Sayko does not disclose “means for retrieving the private communication information *stored by the storing means when the communication re-enters the network from the out-of-network entity*, and means for restoring the private communication information *retrieved by the retrieving means* to the communication” as recited in amended claim 47. (Emphasis added.) Moreover, neither Sayko nor Rozenblit, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest a control module comprising “means for determining that *a communication* originally directed to an in-network called number is to be redirected *to an out-of-network entity*; means for removing the private communication information *from the communication after the determining means has determined that the communication is to be redirected to the out-of-network entity*; means for storing the private communication information *removed by the removing means*; [and] means for redirecting *the communication* to the out-of-network entity *after the private communication information has been removed by the removing means and stored by the storing means*” as recited in amended claim 47 and having all of the other features recited in amended claim 47. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, neither Sayko nor Rozenblit, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest a control module having all of the features recited in amended claim 47.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 47, as amended, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sayko and/or Rozenblit for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, claims 48-50, which depend from now allowable amended claim 47, are patentable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing Response places this application in condition for allowance. If the Primary Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, to facilitate the prosecution, please call the undersigned at 404.495.3678. No fee is due, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(f),(g) or (h) or any deficiency of fees and credit of any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3537.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher W. Glass/
Christopher W. Glass
Attorney for Applicant on the Record
Reg. No. 55,208

August 19, 2009

AT&T Legal Dept. - MMM
Attention: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Customer No.: 82998